

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended on page 4 to incorporate the subject matter of page 11, lines 25-29 and page 9, line 13.

Claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-22 are pending. Claim 9 has been cancelled, claims 1, 7, 11-13 and 16-18 have been amended, and claims 20-22 have been added. Basis for the amendments to claims 1, 12 and 17 can be found in various parts of the specification, including at page 7, lines 17-23 and page 11, lines 25-29. The term "single ply" was added in an earlier amendment during the international phase and has now been removed from claims 1 and 17. Claim 7 has been amended to provide the web is formed by wet laying or air laying. Claim 11 has been amended to be consistent with claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended to be consistent with claim 12. Basis for the amendments to claim 17 can be found in various parts of the application, including at page 6, lines 3-9. Claim 16 has been amended to be consistent with claim 12 and claim 18 has been amended to be consistent with claim 17. Basis for new claim 20 can be found in various parts of the specification, including at page 6, lines 10-22 and page 8, lines 26-30. New claims 21-22 have basis in various parts of the specification including at page 11, lines 3-23.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viazmensky '581 or Win '635. Reconsideration is requested.

The present application is directed to a wet wipe and to a method of making a wet wipe that retains less of a cationic lotion when used as compared to prior known

wet wipes. The applicants discovered that the incorporation of a chemical blocking agent improved the transfer of the lotion onto a surface contacted by the wipe. The methods described herein are particularly useful in the manufacture of disinfectant wipes, as they enable lower quantities of disinfectant to be incorporated into a wet wipe in order to achieve a particular concentration of disinfectant in a surface that is wiped.

Viazmsky '581 is directed to a wet wipe having improved wet strength, wet thickness and wet toughness. These improvements are accomplished by incorporating up to 2 % of a wet strength agent into the wipe material. It is noted that Viazmsky is assigned to the same owner as the present application.

Viazmsky '581 provides that use of a wet strength agent without entanglement reduces absorption (col. 1, lines 64-68), and that when a wet strength agent is used in combination with entanglement, "the web material exhibits no significant reduction in absorption capacity" (col. 2, lines 39-40). Thus, this document suggests that if one wants to deposit a material such as a disinfectant on a surface being wiped, a wet strength agent should not be used in combination with an entanglement process.

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Viazmsky '581 of a web comprising a spunbond or carded substrate. Furthermore, there is no indication in this document that the inclusion of certain wet strength agents would improve the migration of a chemical lotion from a wipe comprising a spunbond or carded web to a surface which is wiped by at least 10%. Viazmsky '581 does not teach or suggest independent claims 1, 12 and 17 of the present application, which provide for reduced retention of the cationic lotion by the web material. Thus, independent claim 1, 12 and 17, and the claims depending from these claims, are not obvious over Viazmsky '581. Reconsideration is requested.

Win '635 is directed to a flushable premoistened personal wipe having three layers that are attached to each other by edge embossing. The two outer plies contain a set strength agent to provide wet poke-through resistance to two large, centrally-located unembossed regions. The center ply contains no wet strength agent, thereby

Application No. 10/518,180
Amendment dated March 26, 2008
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2007

aiding in dispersibility. This document does not address the relationship between wet strength and absorption by the wipe. Furthermore, there is no disclosure or teaching of cellulose entangled with a spunbond or carded substrate that is chemically blocked and soaked in a chemical lotion. Thus, this document does not render obvious the claims of the present application. Reconsideration is requested.

New dependent claim 20 provides that the Spunbond or carded web comprises bicomponent fibers. Neither cited reference teaches or suggests this feature of the claimed wipe.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Vaughan R. Annis et al

By: *Diane F. Covello*
Diane F. Covello
Registration No. 34,164
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicants

Date: March 26, 2008
750 Main Street – Suite 1400
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
Telephone: 860-527-9211
Our Ref: AWL/116/PC/US